1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA (Asheville)
3	No. 1:20-cv-00066-WGY
4	
5	CARYN DEVINS STRICKLAND, formerly known as JANE ROE, Plaintiff
6	FILED
7	ASHEVILLE DIVISION
8	Aug 03 2022 U.S. District Court
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al, Western District of N.C.  Defendants
10	
11	****
12	
13	For Zoom Hearing Before: Judge William G. Young
14	ouage william G. Toung
15	Status Conference
16	Haitad Otataa Diatuist Caret
17	United States District Court District of Massachusetts (Boston)
18	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210
19	Thursday, July 14, 2022
20	* * * * * *
21	
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
25	

```
APPEARANCES
1
 2
 3
    COOPER J. STRICKLAND, ESQ.
    PROFESSOR JEANNIE SUK GERSEN, ESQ.
       Law Office of Cooper Strickland
 4
       P.O. Box 92
 5
       Lynn, NC 28750
       (828) 817-3703
 6
       Email: Cooper.strickland@gmail.com
       For the plaintiff
 7
8
    JOSHUA MICHAEL KOLSKY, ESQ.
       U.S. Department of Justice
       1100 L Street NW
 9
       Washington, DC 20005
10
       (202) 305-7664
       Email: Joshua.kolsky@usdoj.gov
11
       For defendants
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

(Begins, 11:00 a.m.)

THE CLERK: This is Civil Action 20-00066, Roe versus United States, et al. The Court is in session.

THE COURT: Good morning counsel. This is a status conference following remand from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. We are conducting it on our zoom platform. Our host for this conference is my law clerk, Dan Hohler. I have other law clerks on the line. The proceedings are taken down by our Official Court Reporter, Rich Romanow.

These proceedings are open to the public. If any members of the public are present, you are of course welcome. I must remind you to keep your microphones muted and that the rules of court remain in full force and effect and that is to say that there is no taping, streaming, rebroadcast, screen shots, or other transcription of these proceedings.

With that taken care of, would counsel identify themselves, starting with the plaintiff.

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, good morning, your Honor, my name is Cooper Strickland and I represent the plaintiff, Caryn Strickland. Just for the Court's information, she's present with me. And I also want to introduce Professor Gersen, um, she has not yet been admitted, but

that's pending.

THE COURT: And good morning again to you,

Mr. Strickland, and of course Ms. Strickland is welcome.

And, Professor, you likewise are welcome. I see you've signed pleadings here and, um, I accept that you -- I'm pleased to have you in the proceeding and, um, expect that you will be admitted pro hac vice in the Western District of North Carolina.

And for the defendants?

MR. KOLSKY: Good morning, your Honor, Joshua Kolsky on behalf of the defendants.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Kolsky, good morning to you, sir.

Well my reason for calling this conference is to get the case back on track and, um, I see that there are various pending matters, certain of them I can rule on, um, others I cannot or I choose not to, or I don't think I should. But my major goal here is to set out a timeline for resolution, um, final resolution and judgment in this case. Let's deal with the matters on which I can rule.

There is a motion made by the plaintiffs for default. That motion is denied without prejudice. Now my reasoning is as follows.

I entertained this case substantively on the

motion to dismiss. I granted the motion to dismiss. As I understand the rules, that mooted all other orders which had been entered provisionally on the theory that I would deny the motion to dismiss. Properly an appeal has been taken. That appeal has resulted in the Court being affirmed in various respects and reversed in some and the case remanded under a mandate from the Court of Appeals. I fully accept that and so we're going forward.

The next matter is the defendants' motion to have a date set for their answer. They propose the 29th of July. That's acceptable. That motion is allowed.

It's suggested in those papers that the case ought not proceed as against the defendants in their official capacities. Um, there may be merit to that, but I am not so ruling at this point and my reason again, here's -- the way I read the Fourth Circuit's decision, it's at least possible that, um, this Court might conclude that the present, um, guidance, standards, plans, of the -- to remedy the act complained of here are inadequate, and in that case it would be my duty to enter an order against the offending parties in their official capacities. If --

Mr. Kolsky, if you really do want to challenge and get certain of the defendants or in particular

capacities get them out of the case, I suggest now, in this procedural posture, answer and then move for judgment on the pleadings because under the mandate rule of course I'm going to fully comply with the mandate of the Fourth Circuit.

Now the third thing is the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. I take no action on the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment though we can discuss a briefing on that. But in fairness I don't really see it going anywhere. Not to express any opinion at all on the merits, but it depends in large measure on the fact that certain requests for admission were not answered. And again, I think when I granted the motion to dismiss, in part erroneously, um, that mooted those matters and there was no longer any obligation to respond to it.

So, um, I take no action with respect to the motion for summary judgment. It's pending. We can discuss how we're going to deal with it.

But where I'd like to start is when are we going to get the case to trial? There are matters to be tried here now. The defense will answer. I think there's much to the plaintiff's moving papers on default and the summary judgment, there isn't too much to discover here I wouldn't think.

So let me ask the plaintiff, Mr. Strickland,

Professor Gersen, when do you want to go to trial on this matter?

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, your Honor, thank you for the opportunity. I want to just cover a couple of points that you raise first, if I can. Something you said about Professor Gersen's admission made it sound like maybe the District Court is going to do that here. I think they're probably waiting on you to do that. If I understand their practice correctly, it would be the judge that she's appearing before. And that's --

THE COURT: I stand corrected and, um, to the extent I'm familiar -- I'm not familiar with pro hac vice practice in the Western District of North Carolina, but analogizing it to our practice here in Massachusetts, I have utterly no objection to her admission. Here in Massachusetts we charge a fee. So, um, may I say that assuming that the procedural requirements of the district in which I'm visiting are met, I do admit Professor Gersen with pleasure.

Is that satisfactory to you?

MR. STRICKLAND: Oh, yes, thank you, your Honor.

The other point I want to make is that, um, before
I guess proceeding with selecting trial dates, I just
want to note an objection to revising the pretrial -our pretrial order or scheduling order prior to a ruling

on dispositive motions. You indicated that -- it sounded like what you had entered as a text entry in May you considered to be a provisional order. I did not see any evidence of that in what you entered.

More importantly, there was never a stay of discovery in which that initiated and there was no, um, no movement out of the defendants to move the dispositive motions date or the trial date. And I thought it was crystal clear during your May hearing in 2020 that we were moving forward. And so one of the points --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Your objection is noted, your rights are saved.

In that order, when were we going to trial?

MR. STRICKLAND: Um, well given what we've experienced so far, I can see a whole host of problems with the discovery process involving the defendant, so I think it's going to take a long time.

What's the latest date you can provide?

THE COURT: Well if, um -- the latest date, um -it seems to me there's a great public interest in
resolving the matter. But if I were to treat this
normally, the latest date that I could provide is
September of 2023.

I would have thought that you wanted a trial much

faster than that?

MR. STRICKLAND: Um, not given the prior problems we had.

THE COURT: Well let me turn to the defense.

How does a September 2023 trial date suit?

MR. KOLSKY: Your Honor, I think that's acceptable to the defendants. I, um, expect that we will need a significant amount of time for discovery based on the voluminous nature of the discovery requests that plaintiff served previously. So I think we're going to need probably around 6 months for discovery, that's nonexpert discovery, then probably a few months for expert discovery, and then time to brief summary judgment.

THE COURT: Well here's what we're going to do.

The case is placed on this court's -- I mean I'm a

visiting judge in the District of North Carolina, but

the case now is equitable and it's my responsibility, so

I will handle the trial through to judgment. The case

is placed on the running trial list for September 2023.

By August 15th of this year, the parties will meet and

confer and supply a revised case management schedule.

The, um -- you are to agree on everything on which you can agree. You need not agree as to everything.

But on the same documents, if there is a plaintiff's

position and a defendants' position, you will set forth those separate provisions. Then, like a baseball arbitrator -- and I was taught this by the distinguished Judge Robert Keeton, Professor Gersen, one of your former colleagues, he taught me that like a baseball arbitrator I will choose the most reasonable proposal. I am not going to middle it or micromanage the case.

So I've given you now both the opportunity and the incentive to be reasonable. It's my judgment that when you do that to lawyers, competent lawyers will be reasonable, and I can pretty much sign the proposal. Where there are differences, I will choose the most reasonable approach.

I do require that the latest date -- if we're going to go to trial in September 2023, the latest date for filing dispositive motions, motions for summary judgment, is June 1, 2023. The reason for that is I treat them very seriously, I staff them up, I give them an oral hearing.

Now let's see. One other, um -- and I might as well state it now. If it's thought that we will have experts here, I require -- well the rules require that the experts be disclosed obviously and their reports be furnished. I have the added requirement that no expert will testify to anything that's not in the expert's

report, that is to say it's an evidentiary objection if the expert gets on the stand and starts wandering from the report. I expect the reports to be passed up to me at the time the expert testifies and either side can simply say "Well, I object, it's not in the report," and if it's not, I will not hear it. Everything, diagrams, spreadsheets, anything to which the expert is going to testify must be in the report.

Now I think really that's everything I have to say. I am open for questions. And, Mr. Strickland, you had the floor and why don't you continue.

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, your Honor.

One of the points I think you made on summary judgment was that it relies on a request for admission, um, that is not the main point of why it is appropriate to rule on the dispositive motions now. I think it's pretty clear that, um, in the defendant's response, um, and the materials to be provided in support of that, there is no genuine disputed material facts. For example, one of the very clear points that the Fourth Circuit made was that there would be a due process violation if Mr. Martinez, the Federal Defender, was not disqualified and that it was communicated to the plaintiff that he was the decision-maker. Those things are satisfied very clearly by things that are already in

the record, declarations.

For example, James Ishida, Circuit Executive, he made very clear that Judge Gregory did not disqualify the Federal Defender.

THE COURT: Wait. Wait a minute. You may be right, you may be absolutely right, but remember that both this Court and the Fourth Circuit, um, were acting with respect to your complaint on a motion to dismiss. On that motion to dismiss I had to take everything in your favor and I did that. And as I read the opinion of the Fourth Circuit, it takes every factual matter, um, giving all intendments in your favor as they were well-pleaded in your complaint.

I -- while I am absolutely governed by the mandate of the Court of Appeals and I accept it, I accept it capaciously, I want you to know, I -- I don't think that this is like a remand after a trial, it's not, it's a remand where the Court of Appeals said, "Well you were right to dismiss on this and that ground and you were wrong in the following respect," and the mandate is "further proceedings in accordance with this order." And that's precisely what I'm going to give.

MR. STRICKLAND: Okay.

THE COURT: So, wait a minute, this is not the time to argue it, but if you want to be heard on your

motion for summary judgment, let's figure out an appropriate time for hearing, and here's what I propose.

They're going to answer by the 29th. We'll give them until, um, the end of August to respond to your motion for summary judgment and I will schedule a hearing promptly in December -- in September, excuse me, of this year.

How does that suit?

MR. STRICKLAND: They have already filed their response. The motions are fully briefed. They don't -- they should not be allowed a redo before the hearing.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Kolsky --

MR. STRICKLAND: I just want to make one point --

THE COURT: -- how about a hearing date in September?

MR. KOLSKY: Your Honor, um, I plan to be out of the office at the end of August, so if we could have, um, maybe until the middle of September for our response?

THE COURT: Well it would not be a response, he says everything is fully briefed.

MR. KOLSKY: Um, we did file an opposition to their summary judgment motion two years ago, but plaintiffs have now sought leave to supplement their

summary judgment motion. If they are permitted to file a supplemental brief addressing the Fourth Circuit's opinion, I think we should be allowed likewise to address the Fourth Circuit's opinion and to submit in any evidence in light of the plaintiff's new argument.

THE COURT: I think that's right.

Mr. Strickland --

MR. STRICKLAND: May I be heard on that point, your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. STRICKLAND: Okay. The supplemental memorandum, it does not present any new evidence, it does not present any new legal argument, what it did is apply the prior summary judgment filing to the Fourth Circuit's ruling.

In response to that the defendants had an opportunity to do the same, they said something along the line that they do not see that it's beneficial to do so, they had an opportunity and they refused it. And, no, they should not be allowed to present new evidence, they already had an opportunity to do that with their prior response in 2020.

THE COURT: Well I've already spoken to how I conceive of the orders earlier entered before the appeal, but we will give them a chance further to

respond. You filed the supplementary memorandum, we'll 1 give them until -- what is it? We'll give them until 2 the 22nd of August to respond and then we'll set a hearing date in September, um, after the 15th, having in 4 5 mind Mr. Kolsky's schedule. Is that satisfactory to you, Mr. Strickland? 6 7 MR. STRICKLAND: Um, I don't think so, no, I 8 believe I object to that. THE COURT: Well when do you want to do it? 9 10 MR. STRICKLAND: Again they should not be allowed 11 to file a response.

THE COURT: Well I'm letting them file a response, and you object to it, and your rights are saved.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When do you want the hearing? You want a hearing, I take it?

MR. STRICKLAND: Um, I don't believe they have any evidence that they can present at a hearing.

THE COURT: No, no, a summary judgment hearing is not a place to present evidence. You can argue whether I ought consider whatever they say.

When do you want this hearing? I'm suggesting September.

MR. STRICKLAND: I assume that will have to work. And with Professor Gersen weighing in on that though, if she has an opinion.

```
THE COURT: Yeah.
1
           Professor, if I set it sometime between the 15th
 2
 3
     and 30th of September?
           PROFESSOR GERSEN: I don't have an objection to
 4
 5
     those dates.
           THE COURT: That's fine. And my practice is fully
 6
 7
     to prepare for such a hearing and argument probably
8
     won't last more than 15 minutes a side.
           So are there other matters that we should deal
 9
10
     with on -- at this status conference?
11
           Mr. Strickland?
12
           MR. KOLSKY: Your Honor, I have a couple issues --
13
           THE COURT: Well, wait, wait, Mr. Kolsky, we'll
14
     start with Mr. Strickland.
15
           Mr. Strickland, anything more?
16
           MR. STRICKLAND: Um, yes.
17
           Does the Court intend to rule on the bill of costs
     that was entered without objection?
18
19
           THE COURT: Not at this time. But you've raised
     it and I'll consider that.
20
21
           MR. STRICKLAND: Um, that may be the only other
     point I had. But again I would defer to Professor
22
23
     Gersen if she had anything that she'd like to bring up.
           THE COURT: Yes, Professor?
24
25
           PROFESSOR GERSEN: Nope.
```

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

And, Mr. Kolsky?

MR. KOLSKY: Thank you, your Honor, I have a couple of issues I wanted to raise. The first relates both to the answer and to the supplemental summary judgment brief that we would be filing.

The issue is that the complaint contains many allegations about the mediation that Ms. Strickland participated in as part of the EDR process, and there are specific allegations about statements that she alleged she was told by the Fourth Circuit mediator.

We -- now normally statements made during a mediation are confidential. We think it's pretty clear that because Ms. Strickland has made allegations about what was allegedly said in mediation, she can't claim confidentiality now, and we should be permitted to speak with the mediator and he should be permitted to tell us whether it's correct or not.

THE COURT: Wait. Wait. I'm not entering substantive orders. If you want to get that relief, if that's what you seek, you must file a motion. You're under an obligation to answer and surely you can answer. If you think you need to speak with a mediator before filing this brief on the 22nd, there's plenty of time for you to make a motion and I'll deal with it.

MR. KOLSKY: Thank you, your Honor. 1 The other issue is that, um -- and I just want to 2 3 make sure I understand the Court's ruling with respect to the discovery requests that were served by plaintiffs 4 5 back in 2020, my understanding is we're not obligated to 6 respond to those? 7 That is my ruling, you're not, they THE COURT: 8 all were mooted by this Court's partially correct and partially erroneous grant of the motion to dismiss. 9 10 That's the Court's ruling. 11 MR. KOLSKY: Thank you, your Honor. We have nothing further. 12 13 THE COURT: Again I want to save money. They can 14 be renewed simply by a statement -- once you've 15 answered, simply by a statement saying "We renew the 16 following requests earlier made." It's silly to force 17 them to do something a second time. I will accept that. The docket makes clear what they were. 18 19 All right. Is there anything else that we should 20 do today? I hear nothing. 21 MR. STRICKLAND: I have one more question, your 22 Honor, in light of Mr. Kolsky. 23 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Strickland.

MR. STRICKLAND: So when we had this, um, I assume

it's going to be an initial attorneys conference again,

24

25

that's forthcoming, correct? 1 2 THE COURT: I expect it. I expect it. But work 3 it out in discovery, yes. MR. STRICKLAND: So the initial disclosures are 4 5 going to have to be provided within 14 days of that meeting, the rules of civil procedure are going to bind 6 that, there's nothing the defendants can say, "We're not 8 going to provide those again"? THE COURT: Well I make my rulings and I've made 9 them, so I think that's sufficient guidance to go 10 11 forward. 12 MR. STRICKLAND: All right. Okay. So another "for example" is that we could provide requests for 13 14 production at the initial attorneys conference and they 15 would have to respond to that? We are in discovery now, 16 it's not provisional, we're in discovery, um, once we 17 meet certain milestones? THE COURT: Well once they've answered we are. 18 19 MR. STRICKLAND: Yeah, okay. 20 THE COURT: Once they've answered. 21 All right. I look forward to working with you 22 all. And thank you very much. Have a good summer. I 23 will deal with the matters as they come up and we will 24 surely meet via zoom to entertain the motion for summary

judgment. We'll recess.

25

```
(Ends 11:20 a.m.)
1
 2
 3
                     CERTIFICATE
 4
             I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER,
 5
 6
     do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true
     and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes
8
     before Judge William G. Young, on Thursday, July 14,
9
     2022, to the best of my skill and ability.
10
11
12
     /s/ Richard H. Romanow 08-02-22
13
     RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```